

REMARKS

Claims 1, 21 and 41 are amended. Claims 1-44 are pending.

Claims 1-11, 17-20, 21-31, 37-40 and 41-44 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,736,910 to Townsend, et al. ("Townsend") in view of U.S. Patent 6,212,274 to Ninh ("Ninh").

Claims 12-16 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Townsend in view of Ninh and further in view of US Patent 4,677,518 to Hershfield ("Hershfield"). Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

In order to maintain a rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §103, the Office Action must show a combination of the teachings in the prior art that corresponds to the claim limitations. See, e.g., M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). The prior art is devoid of limitations shown in the independent claims as is discussed below.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1, as amended, which are neither disclosed nor suggested even in a combination of the art of record are:

a transient voltage suppression component electrically
coupled to said contacts and said terminals including:
a transient voltage suppression device having a capacitance
and a frequency compensation device, wherein said
frequency compensation device is effective to neutralize
said capacitance of said transient voltage suppression
device.

Similarly, among the limitations of independent claim 21, as amended, which are neither disclosed nor suggested even in a combination of the art of record are:

said transient voltage suppression component comprising:
a transient voltage suppression device having a capacitance
and a frequency compensation device, wherein said
frequency compensation device is effective to neutralize
said capacitance of said transient voltage suppression
device.

Among the limitations of independent claim 41, as amended, which are neither disclosed nor suggested even in a combination of the art of record are:

said transient voltage suppression component including:
a transient voltage suppression device having a capacitance
and a frequency compensation device, wherein said
frequency compensation device is effective to neutralize
said capacitance of said transient voltage suppression
device.

Among the limitations of independent claim 43, which are neither disclosed nor suggested even in a combination of the art of record are:

shunting a transient voltage introduced to the circuit using a transient voltage suppression device; and
frequency compensating for the shift in frequency caused by the capacitance of the transient voltage suppression device.

The Office Action agrees that the Townsend reference does not disclose a frequency compensation device and points to Fig. 7 of Ninh and specifically to element RV1 as corresponding to the claimed transient voltage suppression device and the elements L1-L2 as corresponding to the claimed frequency compensation device. As stated in a prior Communication, the Ninh specification clearly states that inductors L1 and L2 form part of a low pass filter circuit. "Inductors L1 and L2 and capacitors C1, C2, and C4 form a low-pass filter which attenuates frequencies above the desired audio range of the telephone signal." Ninh, Col. 11, lines 31-33. Inductors L1 and L2 are not related to capacitance in element RV1 and certainly inductors L1 and L2 are not effective to neutralize such a capacitance. Therefore, it is asserted that independent claims 1, 21, 41, and 43 are patentable over even a combination of Townsend and Ninh.

The reference to Hershfield is not cited to show, and does not appear to show, the above-referenced limitations. As such, it is asserted that independent claims 1, 21, 41 and 43 are patentable over even a combination of Townsend, Ninh and Hershfield. Dependent claims 2-20,

22-40 and 44 include the above-referenced limitations for independent claims 1, 21 and 43 respectively, and include additional limitations which, when combined with limitations of independent claims 1, 21 and 43 are also neither shown nor suggested in the art of record. It is asserted that these claims are patentable as well. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested in light of the remarks above.

It is asserted that the present Communication places the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal. It is noted that claim 43 retains its original language and recites "frequency compensating for the shift in frequency caused by the capacitance of the transient voltage suppression device." As such, no additional prior art search should be necessitated by this Communication.

The director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit or any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-2820.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims herein are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Rubin
Registration No. 43,063

January 2, 2007

Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
9th Floor
250 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10177-0030
Telephone: 212.986.1116
Facsimile: 212.986.0604
e-Mail: srubin@wolfblock.com